

Invoking Membership Categories Through Marked Person Reference Forms in Parent-Child Interaction

Ruey-Ying Liu¹

Teachers College, Columbia University

ABSTRACT

Based on video-recordings and transcripts from parent-child conversations, this paper examines how marked person references can be designed to invoke relevant membership categories. Through detailed analyses guided by the principles of Conversation Analysis and Membership Categorization Analysis, I show that categories invoked through marked person references allow speakers to account for and upgrade the social actions they are performing. Findings of this study contribute to research on person reference and membership categorization, and in particular, the crossover between the two. They also provide insights into how parents employ language practices as a resource for socializing children into their family roles.

INTRODUCTION

When referring to persons in conversation, participants make use of a range of expressions. These expressions can be identified either as unmarked usage or marked usage. Unmarked person reference forms accomplish simple reference. In contrast, by departing from the unmarked usage, marked person reference forms draw immediate attention from the conversation participants and accomplish distinctive social actions in addition to referring (Schegloff, 1996). In this paper, I focus on a specific use of marked person reference forms to invoke membership categories. That is, when using the marked form to do referencing, the speaker is at the same time activating a locally relevant category. Since categorization terms are also designed to accomplish certain social actions (Stokoe, 2012), the practice of invoking a membership category through marked person reference allows the speaker to strengthen the social action that he or she is performing in the interaction. This paper specifically examines parents' use of this practice in parent-child interaction and describes how parents utilize the categories as a means to establish a behavior standard for children, thereby socializing them into their family roles.

In what follows, I first synthesize the literature on person reference, membership categorization, and language socialization within the family. Following a description of the data and methods, I analyze five examples. For each example, the membership category invoked by the marked person reference is identified, and the social action being performed by the speaker is discussed. Findings of the present study contribute to research on person reference and membership categorization, as well as provide insight into language socialization by illustrating

¹ Ruey-Ying Liu received her MA in Applied Linguistics from Teachers College, Columbia University and will be pursuing her PhD in Sociology at UCLA. Her research interest is Conversation Analysis. Correspondence should be sent to Ruey-Ying Liu. E-mail: rl2491@tc.columbia.edu.

how parents employ language practices as a resource for socialization.

BACKGROUND

In conversation, referring to persons can be done using various forms, such as pronouns (e.g., *she*), names (e.g., *Sarah*), recognitional descriptors (e.g., *your sister*, *that next door neighbor*), and nonrecognitionals (e.g., *someone*, *the woman*). In order to identify whether a certain person reference is doing simple referencing or doing more than referencing, Schegloff (1996) argues that departures from the default person references would be marked usage, indicating something other than referring is being done. In this regard, three types of marked forms have been identified: *departure from the dedicated form* (Schegloff, 1996), *departure from the default position* (Schegloff, 1996), and *alternative recognitional* (Stivers, 2007). When referring to the speaker and the recipient in conversation, the default usage is the dedicated form, namely the pronouns *I* and *you* as well as their grammatical variants (i.e., *me*, *my*, *mine*, etc.). *Departure from the dedicated form*, such as the speaker's use of his/her own name instead of *I* for self-referencing, would be doing more than referencing (Schegloff, 1996). In addition to the form used, Schegloff (1996) also examines the sequential position of person reference when identifying marked usage. When a person is being referred to in a conversation for the first time, the default form for this locally initial position would be full noun phrases or names. On the other hand, when this person is being referred to again later in the conversation, the default form for this locally subsequent position would be pronouns. *Departure from the default position* refers to mismatches between reference form and sequential position (i.e., locally initial forms in locally subsequent positions and locally subsequent forms in locally initial positions), which would be considered marked usage. The last category, *alternative recognitional*, refers to recognitional descriptors used by the speaker when the default third-person reference forms, namely names or kin terms, are available and known to the conversation participants (e.g., using *that woman* when the speaker and the recipient both know and remember that the referent's name is *Jane*) (Stivers, 2007). These three types of marked reference forms invite the addressed recipient to examine them for what they are doing in addition to referring in conversation (Schegloff, 1996).

In addition to person reference, membership categorization offers another way of mentioning persons in conversation. According to Schegloff (2007a), categories are classifications or social types that the speaker uses to identify, describe, or formulate persons (e.g., *women*, *professors*, *vegetarians*, *conservatives*, *20-year-olds*, etc.). Categories of person which figure in interaction are organized into Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs), collections of categories that go together with rules of application. For example, *Buddhist*, *Catholic*, *Jew* and *Muslim* are some categories, among the others, of the MCD *religion*. When the speaker activates a category from an MCD in conversation, he or she is implying or performing a social action based on its category-bound predicates (Stokoe, 2012), which can be activities, rights, obligations, motives, and competencies that are expectably and properly done by members of that particular category (Pomerantz & Mandelbaum, 2005). For instance, Stokoe (2009) shows that speakers invoke certain categories and category-bound predicates in order to accomplish social actions related to complaining and denying in neighbor disputes.

While person reference and membership categorization are two distinct sets of practices that serve different purposes (Schegloff, 2007b), some mentions of persons can be used to do both referencing and categorizing. For example, *Dad* can be used to refer to the speaker's father,

and it can also be treated as a category from the MCD *family*. For the purpose of this paper, a mention that can serve both as a marked person reference form and a categorization term is called *focal mention*. A practice that utilizes a focal mention to do referencing and categorizing in conversation is termed *focal practice*. By describing the focal practice, the current study provides insight into the crossover between marked person reference and membership categorization.

Focusing on parent-child interaction, this paper specifically examines how the focal practice is deployed in parental directives. Directives are attempts by the speaker to get the recipient to perform a certain action (Searle, 1976) and can be formulated as requests, suggestions, warnings, prohibitions, orders, proposals, assignments, invitations, commands, and advice (Stevanovic & Svennevig, 2015). In parent-child interaction, parental directives can be conceptualized as an indicator of parents' deontic authority over children, suggesting parents' entitlement and obligation to set the standards for children's behavior (Kent, 2012). Therefore, parental directives, as a type of speech act, can serve as a resource for language socialization at home. According to Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), language socialization refers to socialization through the use of language and socialization to use the language of the particular social group. The notion concerns how children become communicatively and culturally competent within their homes through language use and focuses on "the identities, stances or values, and practices that characterize membership in a particular cultural group that newcomers are expected to appropriate" (Duff, 2008, p. xiii). In other words, when issuing directives, parents are socializing children into their family roles by stating or implying the practices that children are expected to appropriate. By analyzing how parents utilize the focal practice, the current study demonstrates the process of parents socializing children into their family roles and contributes to existing research on family interaction and language socialization.

DATA AND METHOD

The video-recorded data are from a U.S., English-speaking family, comprising approximately 3.5 hours of conversations involving a three-year-old child, Katie (pseudonym), and her family, including her mother, father, grandfather, and grandmother, as they were doing everyday activities at home. Katie's 18-month-old sister, Ellie (pseudonym), was also present at most family interactions, but did not produce meaningful utterances in the conversations due to her limited verbal ability. Some of the videos were recorded by a single camera placed on a tripod, while others were recorded by the author of this paper, who is related to the family. My presence was not considered interruptive given that I am familiar with all the family members, notably the two young children, and visit them regularly.

In the video data, five instances of focal practice were identified. These five extracts were transcribed according to the Jefferson (2004) system (see the appendix for transcription conventions), and were subjected to a thorough investigation guided by the principles of Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). As an inductive, qualitative method working from spontaneous, naturally-occurring data, CA aims to identify and describe the tacit practices and structures that underlie social interaction (Stivers & Sidnell, 2013). On the other hand, MCA focuses on the methodical practices that members use "in describing the world, and displaying their understanding of the world and of the commonsense routine workings of society" (Fitzgerald, Housley & Butler, 2009, p. 47). Since the two methods deal with different aspects of discourse practice—CA is suitable for research questions with

sequential concerns and MCA allows the researcher to study categorical issues—this paper applies both CA and MCA to provide a detailed account of how people go categorical in conversation by examining the turn-by-turn unfolding of the selected sequences.

ANALYSIS

In this analysis, five examples are presented to illustrate how marked person reference forms are used to invoke relationship categories in parent-child and grandparent-grandchild conversations. The five examples are organized into three sections based on the type of marked person reference: *departure from the dedicated form*, *departure from the default position*, and *alternative recognitional*. The membership category and its category-bound predicates, as well as the social action performed by the speaker in each example, are discussed in the following sections.

Departure from the Dedicated Form

The first two extracts exemplify how *departure from the dedicated form* (Schegloff, 1996) is deployed to invoke a relevant membership category. In these examples, when doing self-referencing, the speakers depart from the dedicated form *I* or its grammatical deviants and use kin terms instead. According to Stivers (2007), kin terms are person reference forms used for the parents and grandparents of the speaker or the recipient, including *Mom*, *Dad*, *Grandpa*, *Grandma*, and their deviants. It is worthy of note that the kin terms used in Katie's (K's) family are different from those that might be used in a monolingual, English-speaking family because K's grandparents are first-generation Taiwanese immigrants. While the family members speak Standard American English almost exclusively in their daily conversations, they have a preference for using kin terms in Taiwanese or Mandarin Chinese. For instance, they usually use *Mama* for *Mom*, *Baba* for *Dad*, *A-gong* for *Grandpa*, and *A-ma* for *Grandma*, which will be seen in the following extracts.

In Extract 1, K was practicing writing English letters under Dad's (D's) guidance. Mom (M), Grandpa (GP), Grandma (GM), and M's cousin Ray (R) were sitting around and chatting while the TV was on. K first wrote her own name, "Katie," and then M prompted K to write her sister's name, "Ellie." After K had finished writing "Ellie," she announced that she would write everyone else's name, one by one. Extract 1 unfolds as K has finished writing "Mama," "Baba," and "A-ma" respectively, and selects "Ray" to be the next one. The turns with focal mentions are marked with an arrow in the transcript.

Extract 1

- 1 K: I'm doing (.) I'm doing {{{(pointing at R)}-(.) I'm doing her.}=
- 2 GP: → =No no do A-gong first.
- 3 K: ((pointing at R)-NO. I'm gonna do her.
- 4 GM: Do Ray::?=
- 5 D: =<You wanna do> Ray?
- 6 K: Yes.
- 7 GM: Okay.
- 8 K: [Ray.]
- 9 M: [R] is tricky okay? [R::]

- 10 GM: [R is tricky.]
 11 K: ↑I- ↑I- I'm [()]
 12 D: [(gazing at TV))-<oh my goodness.>]
 13 K: ((turning to look at D))-(0.5)
 14 K: ((starting to write on the paper))-°I've got this. °
 15 GM: Okay.
 16 M: It's tricky Baba you help- are you helping?
 17 K: ↑I- ↑I- ↑I can do that=
 18 R: =No she [got this. She got this.]
 19 D: [She's doing great.]
 20 GM: [She got it.] She's got this.
 21 GP: → A-gong is sad.
 22 (1.2)
 23 M: ↑Good jo::b.
 24 GM: [((clapping hands))-R::]
 25 R: [((smiling with her thumbs up))]
 26 K: ((showing her work to everyone))
 27 D: That's a beautiful R.

At line 1, K uses a pointing gesture to indicate that she is going to write R's name next, but GP immediately objects to K and suggests that she should do "A-gong" instead at line 2. GP's use of "A-gong" for self-referencing serves as a membership category *grandfather* from the MCD *family*. When GP makes reference to the relationship category *A-gong*, he makes K's identity as his grandchild relevant since grandfather and grandchild carry obligations in relation to one another. That is, grandfather-grandchild is a standardized relational pair (Stokoe, 2012). Given that K starts with her closest family members (M, D, and GM, respectively) and is now proceeding to R, a more distant relative, the predicate associated with the category *grandfather* is likely to be "grandfather is closer/more important to grandchild compared to other relatives," or more explicitly, "compared to R, *A-gong* is closer/more important to K." In addition, considering that K has just finished writing "A-ma," another possible category-bound predicate is "A-gong should follow A-ma," just like D follows M, since grandfather-grandmother is also a standardized relational pair. Based on the predicates, GP is able to offer an implicit account for the social action that he is performing: urging K to write his name instead. These predicates also imply GP's expectation of how K should behave as a grandchild, which can serve as a resource for GP to socialize K into the role of grandchild.

While "A-gong" at line 2 is a categorization term as well as a kin term used by GP to do self-referencing, it is worth discussing whether it exemplifies the focal practice. After K uses the pronoun *her* to make an announcement at line 1 (i.e., "I'm doing *her*"), it seems that GP could have used the default dedicated form *me* to refer to himself (i.e., "do *me* first"), and the kin term he actually chose should be identified as a marked usage. However, provided that GP's social action is to urge K to write "A-gong" literally, one might argue that the directive seems to make sense only if he explicitly articulates "A-gong," and the default dedicated form *me* may not be available in this case. This interpretation can be supported by the fact that GM and D both confirm with K whether it is "Ray" that she is going to write (line 4-5) after K's use of the pronoun *her* (line 1 and line 3) despite the fact that it is accompanied by a clear pointing gesture. In this regard, the kin term "A-gong" at line 2 may not be a marked form, and the social action is

simply being done through the category-bound predicate but not the marked usage of person reference. Although the interpretation of this practice is debatable, GP's use of *A-gong* later in this conversation, however, can be clearly identified as an example of the focal practice.

After K confirms that she wants to work on "Ray" (line 6 and line 8), M's comment at line 9 indicates that *R* is a challenging letter for young children. However, at line 12, D is distracted by the TV and does not offer guidance as K starts to work on the letter *R*. At line 16, M reminds D that he should pay attention to what K is doing, and as a result, D turns to K again and replies to M at line 19, along with GM and R. In brief, when K is working on the letter *R*, all the family members pay attention to K and participate in this conversation on K's work (line 9-20), except for GP, which implies a complaint regarding the situation. At line 21, GP again uses "A-gong" for self-referencing. Departing from the default usage *I am sad*, GP deploys the focal practice by invoking the category *grandfather* and its category-bound predicate, which could be "grandchild cares about grandfather's feelings," "grandchild complies with grandfather," or the like. The predicate, along with the marked usage of person reference, supports GP's social action of complaining to K for not taking his suggestion. However, the practice turns out to be unsuccessful, as there is no uptake from K or other family members at line 22. K keeps working on the letter, and when she finishes, everyone but GP shows their approval at lines 23-27.

The next example also shows how the speaker uses *departure from the dedicated form* to invoke a relationship category. However, in this case, the focal practice not only accounts for the speaker's social action, but also serves as an upgrade of that action. Extract 2 captures the interaction between K, M, and K's younger sister Ellie (E). Prior to Extract 2, K and M had just finished putting a jigsaw puzzle together and then broken it down into pieces. When M and K were collecting the pieces and returning them to a box, E entered the room and was invited to help by M. However, after E put a couple of pieces back into the box, E and K both stopped collecting the puzzle pieces and started singing together. Extract 2 begins as K and E are singing while M keeps collecting the puzzle pieces.

Extract 2

- 1 K: [((singing, tapping her foot on the floor))]
 2 E: [((singing))]
 3 M: [{{(gazing at E))-HEY, you're ↑not helping.}] ((gazing at K))-
 4 You're ↑not helping either. What is this foot tapping here. Help.
 5 (0.2)
 6 → Help. No? Nobody's gonna help Mama?
 7 (.)
 8 Help? <No one's gonna [help Mama?>]
 9 K: [I'm-I'm] helping.

Because K and E are singing aloud (lines 1-2), M uses a loud "hey" at line 3 to draw their attention. Then, M directs her gaze at E and K, respectively, complaining about their lack of help (lines 3-4), which can be considered an implicit request for their help. However, since K and E do not comply, the indirect request is upgraded at line 4 to a demand with stressed intonation (i.e., "Help"). Note that despite the upgrade of M's request, there is no uptake from K and E at line 5. Although K and E stop singing, neither of them responds to M verbally or physically by collecting the puzzle pieces.

At line 6, M repeats her demand "help" one more time, and then initiates a question.

Deployed to do self-referencing, “Mama” (line 6), as a departure from the dedicated form *me*, is a membership category *mother* from the MCD *family*. Similar to the example shown in Extract 1, through invoking the relationship category *Mama*, M makes K’s and E’s identity as M’s children relevant and reminds them of the obligations linked to this identity. In addition, M invites acknowledgment of a specific category-bound predicate, which is “children help their mother.” As such, one might argue that M offers an implicit account for why K and E should help (i.e., because children help their mother), thereby upgrading her social actions of complaining and requesting.

The fact that M employs the focal practice after previously failed attempts to get K and E to help indicates that the focal practice is deployed as a strategy to upgrade M’s social action. When M’s initial compliant—“you’re ↑not helping” (lines 3-4) fails to get K and E to help, she upgrades her implicit request to a stressed demand (“help” at line 4 and line 6). Then, as M fails again, she deploys the focal practice as another upgrade. M’s focal practice turns out to be successful as K responds to M both verbally and physically at line 9, where she starts to collect the puzzle pieces again. In summary, by using the marked person reference *Mama*, M also invokes the category *mother*, and in so doing, upgrades her complaint and request.

The two examples presented in this section demonstrate that by using kin terms for self-referencing, the speakers invoke relationship categories and their category-bound predicates to strengthen and even upgrade the social actions they are performing. In addition, the predicates serve as behavioral standards that parents and grandparents set for the child.

Departure from the Default Position

This section provides one example of *departure from the default position*. Although kin terms are usually preferred when referring to parents and grandparents in conversation (Stivers, 2007), this example demonstrates that kin terms in locally subsequent positions can be marked as person reference forms and deployed to invoke certain membership categories. The following conversation takes place when GM and D are sitting at the dinner table, and K comes to join them after playing a child learning game called *Olivia*. Extract 3 begins when GM asks K how she likes the game.

Extract 3

- 1 GM: How was that. How was Olivia.
2 (1.0)
3 D: Did you enjoy it? °Katie. Katie. Katie.° A- A-ma bought that
4 for you. Can you tell her about it?
5 (1.0)
6 D: Katie. Ka↑tie. >A-ma bought that for you.< (.) Can you tell
7 → A-ma about it? Tell her what you- what do [you like?]
8 K: [She-] I like the-
9 this movie parts (.) and the () parts.
10 M: Oh::?

At line 1, GM’s question selects K to provide a response. However, K is looking away and does not take up the turn at line 2. At line 3, D prompts K with the question “did you enjoy it.” Since K is still looking away, D seeks to obtain her attention by calling her name three times in a

row (line 3). Then, D refers to GM using the kin term “A-ma” (line 33) and the pronoun “her” (line 34) when providing an account for why K should respond (i.e., “A-ma bought *Olivia* for you, so you should answer her question about the game”). Both person reference forms are unmarked since “A-ma” is a locally initial form in a locally initial position, and “her” is a locally subsequent form in a locally subsequent position.

D’s social action of urging K to answer GM appears to fail as there is still no uptake from K at line 5. In response to K’s lack of reaction, D upgrades his request by calling K’s name in a raised pitch and repeating the account (i.e., “A-ma bought that for you”) with decreased speed (line 6), implying that this is a highly relevant message (Uhmann, 1992). Moreover, when repeating his request, D replaces the default pronoun “her” that he uses at line 4 with “A-ma” at line 7. The kin term here is a marked third-person reference since it is a locally initial form deployed in a locally subsequent position. At the same time, the use of “A-ma” invokes the category *grandmother* from the MCD *family*. The category-bound predicate designed to strengthen D’s request could be “grandchild responds to grandmother,” or more generally, “grandchild treats grandmother politely.” D’s upgrade of his social action finally leads to K’s response at lines 8-9.

While in this case, the kin term serves as a third-person reference but not self-reference, this example of *departure from the default position* is similar to the extracts shown in the previous section as they all deploy the marked usage of a kin term to activate a relationship category. Moreover, this example also shows how the focal practice is employed as a means to upgrade the speaker’s social action after prior failure, which is similar to what we have observed in Extract 2.

Alternative Recognitional

Alternative recognitionals, as a type of marked person reference, are primarily designed to manage the relationships between the referent, the speaker, and the recipient since they shift the referent inside or outside of the speaker’s or the recipient’s domain of responsibility (Stivers, 2007). In this section, two examples are presented to illustrate the use of *recipient associated recognitionals*, one of the four types of alternative recognitionals identified by Stivers (2007). Recipient associated recognitionals make connections between the referent and the addressed recipient when such connections would not ordinarily be made. For instance, a speaker’s use of “your other son” when referring to his brother in a conversation with his mother would be a recipient associated recognitional, which explicitly places his brother inside his mother’s domain of responsibility.

Extract 4 occurs when M, K, and E are drawing and playing together. Prior to the extract, M attached several markers together to make a stick for E. K saw the stick and wanted one as well. M told K that she would make another one for her, but while M was still making it, K roughly grabbed E’s markers. M admonished K and then assured her that she would get one, too. Extract 4 begins when M shows K the stick that she made for her as promised.

Extract 4

- 1 M: You want that one?
- 2 K: ((*reaching for the stick*))-Yeah yea:h.
- 3 M: ((*holding up the stick*))-Wait. Are you gonna be nice?
- 4 K: Yep.

- 5 M: → Are you gonna share with your sister?
6 K: Yep.
7 M: ((*giving S the stick*))-Alright.

Upon seeing the stick that M made for her (line 1), K appears to be excited, reaching for the stick while replying to M at line 2. However, at line 3, M holds the stick out of K's reach and makes K promise that she will be nice. After K agrees at line 4, M advances her directive by specifying "being nice" as "sharing with your sister" at line 5. Here, M's use of "your sister" as a recipient associated recognitional is a departure from the unmarked third-person reference, i.e., the name *Ellie*. With the recipient associated reference, M explicitly associates E with K, thereby placing E within the domain of K's responsibility.

While positioning the referent within the recipient's domain of responsibility is the primary function of recipient associated recognitionals (Stivers, 2007), relating E to K is not the only social action implied by the focal practice here. By using the marked person reference "your sister," M invokes the category *sister* from the MCD *family* and alludes to a category-bound predicate—"sisters share with each other." By invoking the category and noting the category-bound predicate, M not only makes her directive explicit to K ("share with Ellie"), but provides an account for doing so ("share with Ellie because she is your sister"), which also helps K to appropriate practices that are expected in the sibling relationship.

The focal mention in the following example, "your baby sister," is almost identical to "your sister" in Extract 4. Yet, in Extract 5, the recognitional is deployed after the practice of *departure from the default position* has failed to accomplish the speaker's social action several times. By examining the use of both types of marked person reference in Extract 5, we can better understand how the focal practice is organized in conversation.

In this extract, M asks K to donate some of her toys to people in need since the holiday season is approaching. The following extract unfolds as K announces that they should donate E instead of toys.

Extract 5

- 1 K: We should donate Ellie. ((*smiling*))
2 M: You think we should donate [Ellie?]
3 E: [((*babbling*))]
4 K: Yeah.
5 M: Why should we donate Ellie.
6 E: [((*babbling*))]
7 K: [() we do (.)] Ellie's-Ellie's laughing cuz (.) we should donate her.
8 M: You think we should donate Ellie? Do you think somebody needs
9 a little sister?
10 K: To know that, to donate her.
11 M: You're gonna donate her. °O↓kay°=
12 K: =I wanna donate her. I'll put ↑her to a box, and put her to a ba::g,
13 uh () to a box (.) Put it to open, and lea::ve somebody <with
14 a new baby.> ((*smiling*))
15 M: \$You gonna lea(hh)ve\$ somebody with a new baby and it's
16 gonna be Ellie.
17 K: It's gonna be Ellie.

- 18 M: → Your baby sister.
19 K: My baby sister °yeah°.
20 M: °Okay°.

Throughout the conversation, E is being referred to mostly by the name “Ellie” and the pronoun “her.” While there is usually a preference for the name when doing third-person referencing (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), the name can be a marked form depending on its sequential position in the conversation. At line 1, K’s use of “Ellie” as a locally initial form in a locally initial position is unmarked. Although M’s use of the name in a locally subsequent position at line 2 seems to be a departure from the default position, it is likely that M is merely repeating K’s utterance at line 1 as a confirmation check, asking whether K actually means that E should be donated, and nothing more than referring is being done. Yet, after K’s confirmation at line 4, M’s use of “Ellie” at line 5 is clearly marked. When asking K to provide an account for her proposal, the *why* question form per se should sufficiently serve the purpose. However, M’s use of the locally initial reference form in the locally subsequent position serves to pose a problem for K (Schegloff, 1996). That is, by drawing K’s attention to *Ellie*, M implicitly suggests that E being donated is problematic. This observation is also supported by M’s stress on “Ellie” (line 5).

K’s use of simple reference at line 7 implies that she does not treat donating *Ellie* as problematic. In response to that, M again deploys the mismatched person reference and extends her question at lines 8-9 as a strategy to pursue the expected response (Bolden, Mandelbaum & Wilkinson, 2012). In addition, M invokes the category *little sister* from the MCD *family* (line 9). While this categorization term is designed as an indefinite noun phrase (i.e., *a little sister*) which does not refer to E in particular, M still implicitly notes E’s identity as K’s little sister. The category-bound predicate potentially made relevant by M is “family members do not donate other family members,” or more specifically, “big sisters do not donate little sisters.” That is, the social action that the category-bound predicate is orienting to is to show M’s disapproval of K’s proposal.

In the face of M’s disapproval, K does not back down but continues to talk about the process of donating E using unmarked reference forms at lines 12-14. At line 15-16, M again conveys her disapproval by using the mismatched person reference to refer to E and the extra stress on “Ellie” (line 16). Moreover, by recycling the nonrecognitional “somebody” that K mentioned earlier (line 13), M is likely to imply that “leaving your little sister with a stranger” is not a category-bound predicate of the category “big sister.” However, at line 17, as K partially repeats M’s utterance as a confirmation, she also deploys the marked reference form to refer to E and places stress on “Ellie,” suggesting that she is fully aware of M’s implicit disapproval, but she would like to treat E as the to-be-donated item anyway.

Following K’s refusal to back down, M deploys the alternative recognitional “your baby sister” (line 18) to refer to E as an upgrade of her disapproval. Similar to the example shown in Extract 4, the recipient associated recognitional shifts E into the domain of K’s responsibility and invokes the category *baby sister* from the MCD *family* at the same time. As the focal mention particularly refers to E, the category-bound predicate is also upgraded from the general “big sisters do not donate little sisters” (as suggested at line 9) to specifically “you, as a big sister, do not donate your little sister.” In other words, M’s social action of showing her disapproval is being strengthened and accounted for by the focal practice in two ways: 1) upgrading the marked person reference from the mismatched *Ellie* (line 5) to the recipient associated recognitional *your*

baby sister and 2) upgrading the categorization term from the indefinite *a little sister* (line 9) to the definite *your baby sister*. Also, note that M's shift to "*baby sister*" at line 18 (from "*little sister*" at line 9) may invoke *baby* as another category, highlighting predicates such as "babies should be protected/taken care of by their families."

Throughout this conversation, the person reference forms that M and K use to refer to E reflect their attitudes toward the proposal of donating E. M initially expresses her disagreement by referring to E using locally initial reference forms in locally subsequent positions; however, after repeatedly failing to get K to withdraw her proposal, M deploys the focal practice of "your baby sister" to upgrade her disapproval.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

When people declare to each other their relationship categories, which they do not normally do, they rely on shared assumptions of obligations and other predicates that are viewed as proper for the specific categories (Pomerantz & Mandelbaum, 2005). The category-bound predicates, then, serve as a means for the speakers to accomplish certain social actions in conversation. In this paper, five examples of focal practices which invoke relationship categories from the MCD *family* are presented. With *departure from the dedicated form*, kin terms are used to activate relationship categories and their category-bound predicates, thereby implying the speakers' complaints about the addressed recipients. With *departure from the default position*, kin terms are also used to upgrade the speaker's request. With *alternative recognitionals*, recipient associated recognitionals are deployed to strengthen the speaker's directives and disapproval. In summary, I have shown how marked person reference forms can be designed to invoke relevant relationship categories and how the category-bound predicates allow the speakers to reinforce and upgrade the social actions they perform.

This paper contributes to research on the relationship between person reference and membership categorization. While both practices are used to mention persons, person reference and membership categorization convey different senses of the target object (Schegloff, 2007b). In addition, referring to persons is mostly done by resources other than MCD terms, such as names and pronouns, while categorization terms from MCDs are often used to accomplish actions other than referring, such as identifying, describing, and formulating persons (Schegloff, 2007b). Although the two practices do not normally overlap, this paper demonstrates that some marked person reference forms can serve as a resource for going categorical, as the speaker works toward certain social actions through the category-bound predicates.

Given that these instances are drawn from a young child's verbal interactions with her family members, the analysis also provides insight into the process of language socialization in the family institution. In these examples, parental directives are formulated as suggestions, requests, demands, and hints, showing parents' and grandparents' entitlement to setting the rules regarding what should be done (and what should not be done) for the child. That is to say, the focal practices are deployed not only to express parents' complaints, disapproval, or the like, but also to provide behavior standards for K and thereby socialize her to become a competent member in the family. For instance, by invoking the category *sister* (*alternative recognitional*, Extract 4 and Extract 5), M is setting her expectations of what a big sister should do and should not do to her little sister. Since K is still adjusting to her new family role as a big sister, the category-bound predicates that M activates can be employed as a resource for socializing K into the activities, duties, and obligations that link to the sibling relationship. In summary, by

invoking relationship categories in parental directives, parents are able to socialize children into their family role through the category-bound predicates.

REFERENCES

- Bolden, G., Mandelbaum, J., & Wilkinson, S. (2012). Pursuing a response by repairing an indexical reference. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(2), 137-155.
- Duff, P. A. (2008). Introduction to volume 8: language socialization. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Language socialization: Encyclopedia of language and education*, Vol. 8 (pp. xiii-xix). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Fitzgerald, R., Housley, W., & Butler, C. (2009). Omnirelevance and interactional context. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 36(3), 45-64.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kent, A. (2012). Compliance, resistance and incipient compliance when responding to directives. *Discourse Studies*, 14(6), 711-730.
- Pomerantz, A., & Mandelbaum, J. (2005). A conversation analytic approach to relationships: Their relevance for interactional conduct. In K. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp.149-171). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15-22). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In B. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in anaphora* (pp. 437-485). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007a). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 462-482.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007b). Categories in action: Person-reference and membership categorization. *Discourse Studies*, 9, 433-461.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163-191.
- Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Stevanovic, M., & Svennevig, J. (2015). Introduction: Epistemics and deontics in conversational directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78, 1-6.
- Stivers, T. (2007). Alternative recognitionals in person reference. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 73-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Sidnell, J. (2013). Introduction. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 1-8). Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stokoe, E. (2009). Doing actions with identity categories: Complaints and denials in neighbor disputes. *Text and Talk*, 29(1), 75-97.
- Stokoe, E. (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 14(3), 277-303.

Uhmann, S (1992). Contextualizing relevance: On some forms and functions of speech rate changes in everyday conversation. In P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 297-336). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

APPENDIX A

Transcription Symbols

.	(period) falling intonation.
?	(question mark) rising intonation.
,	(comma) continuing intonation.
-	(hyphen) abrupt cut-off.
::	(colon(s)) prolonging of sound.
<u>word</u>	(underlining) stress.
<u>word</u>	the more underlining, the greater the stress.
WORD	(all caps) loud speech.
°word°	(degree symbols) quiet speech.
↑word	(upward arrow) raised pitch.
↓word	(downward arrow) lowered pitch.
>word<	(more than and less than) quicker speech.
<word>	(less than and more than) slowed speech.
hh	(series of h's) aspiration or laughter.
.hh	(h's preceded by period) inhalation.
(hh)	(h's in parentheses) inside word boundaries.
[]	(lined-up brackets) beginning and ending of
[]	simultaneous or overlapping speech.
=	(equal sign) latch or contiguous utterances of the same speaker.
(1.5)	(number in parentheses) length of a silence in tenths of a second.
(.)	(period in parentheses) micro-pause, 0.2 second or less.
()	(empty parentheses) non-transcribable segment of talk.
((action))	(double parentheses) non-speech activity.
{{(words))-words}}	dash to indicate co-occurrence of nonverbal behavior and verbal elements; curly brackets to mark the beginning and ending of such co-occurrence when necessary.
\$word\$	(dollar signs) smiley voice.